



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

assumption, he finds Celtic influence strong in Northumberland, Cumberland, Lancashire, Cheshire, and the extreme southwest. Southeastern England shows still another racial influence. The Kentish system he believes to have been one of compact rectangular *juga* surviving from the days of the Roman occupation; the east Anglian, with regard to which he is far from convincing, one of *tenementa*, probably originally compact areas, derived from the Roman *juga* but influenced in some way by the Danish Conquest. The splitting up of compact tenements he explains by inheritance by co-heirs, gavelkind in this connection perhaps not antedating the Norman Conquest. Like peculiarities he believes would put the lower Thames basin within the sphere of Roman influence.

Dr. Gray's argument for racial influence as determining field systems seems to rest on too many hypotheses to be conclusive. The fact that the two- and three-field system did not exist in a given district, if it can be always clearly proved that it did not exist, does not necessarily imply Celtic influence, nor is the evidence for Roman survivals satisfactory. Natural conditions, waste, fen inaccessibility, must have had much to do with agricultural development, as Dr. Gray himself admits in explaining deviations from the midland system in the region ascribed to it. Not all such differences need be referred to racial settlement. It is probable that much more local investigation of village arrangements and a far closer study of customs of inheritance in relation to land must be made before conclusions covering so very wide a field can be reached safely. Dr. Gray's book remains, however, a very interesting study of open-field arrangements, especially in the time of enclosures, and an admirable collection of material, drawn from various centuries, relating to the history of agriculture.

N. NEILSON

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

The Boycott in American Trade Unions. By LEO WOLMAN. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXXIV, No. 1. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1916. 8vo, pp. 148. \$1.00.

For thirty-five years the boycott has been one of the chief weapons employed by organized labor. Yet not until Laidler's *Boycotts and the Labor Struggle* was published in 1914 was there any American book comprehensively discussing the boycott. Now we have a second book upon this subject, based principally upon the publications of labor unions and employers' associations.

An important contribution made in this monograph relates to the question, What is the boycott? The author observes that both in judicial declarations and in popular usage "the boycott is a chameleon that is impossible of definition." About everything that a labor union does is by some people called "boycotting." Wolman applies this term only to boycotts on materials and to boycotts on commodities. The former represent a refusal to work with or upon "unfair" materials, while the latter involve abstaining from buying prescribed finished products.

This monograph also advances our knowledge as to why labor unions boycott. Only infrequently are boycotts an expression of malice, or a spontaneous outburst of hatred or contempt. Usually they represent merely a means of coercing employers to make terms with organized labor. Boycotts are resorted to where organization by other means is impossible or unlikely, and yet more frequently to supplement long drawn-out and apparently unsuccessful strikes.

Other questions upon which Wolman throws new light are, How do labor unions boycott? and, When are boycotts successful? It is only the organized workingmen who observe the boycotts proclaimed by labor unions. Only products which are in large part consumed by trade unionists can successfully be boycotted. The problem of a union which undertakes a boycott, then, is to give it publicity among the organized workingmen consuming that product. To this end many different devices have been employed, among others "unfair lists," boycott circulars, picketing, and traveling agents. The Knights of Labor controlled boycotts centrally, while the American Federation of Labor has only indorsed boycotts initiated and prosecuted by national unions and city centrals. The Knights of Labor were very successful with boycotts, as have been unions like the brewery workmen, the garment workers, the hatters, and the printers. Because of the activities of the American Anti-Boycott Association and the decision of the Supreme Court in the Danbury hatters' case, there have been fewer boycotts recently, but boycotting has by no means been wholly abandoned.

To the vital question, What should be the public policy toward boycotting? this book gives no answer. This is the more to be regretted because it is the work of a thorough scholar. Yet he who would solve this problem will here find much that is enlightening. This book presents the facts as to boycotting lucidly and impartially. Readers will differ as to what ought to be done about boycotting, but none of them can fail to understand better the rôle it plays in the American labor movement.

EDWIN E. WITTE